REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 21 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 11-20 and 22 having been canceled previously.

In the Office Action dated March 13, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20.

With this Amendment, claims 1-10 and 21 were amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation and § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-10 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Fujihara, et al., European Patent Application No. 1213111 A2. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The claims require an audio equipment housing made of a material that includes a biodegradable polymer compound, an inorganic material and a hydrolysis inhibitor. The hydrolysis inhibitor is added to the acoustic apparatus housing to prevent the housing from decomposing due to moisture in the air. Specification, Paragraph [0056]. The claims also require a specific gravity of 1.3 g/cm^3 or more. Specific gravity is the ratio of the density (m/V) of a material to the density of water (or a reference density). In a material made of various components, the density can vary based on the amount of each component in a material and the total volume of the material. As such, specific gravity is not an inherent characteristic in a material that is made up of more than one component.

Fujihara et al. teaches a biodegradable resin with mica for use in housing of household appliances. Fujihara et al., Paragraph [0003], [0033]. Fujihara et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest using an audio equipment housing that includes a biodegradable resin or adding hydrolysis inhibitor to a material for an acoustic application. Additionally, Fujihara et al. does not require the biodegradable resin to have a specific gravity of 1.3 g/cm^3 or more. As discussed

above, specific gravity is not an inherent characteristic when the density of a particular material can vary. Thus, Fujihara et al. fails to teach or even fairly suggest the required elements of the claims. As such, the claims are patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the above rejection.

Claims 1-10 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Fujihara, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020128344. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, Fujihara et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest all the requirements of the claims. As such, the claims are clearly patentable over Fujihara et al. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the above rejection.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 12, 2008 By: /David R. Metzger/

David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000

12413802\V-1